arXiv:1702.03021v1 [cs.IT] 10 Feb 2017

ELEMENTARY L^∞ ERROR ESTIMATES FOR SUPER-RESOLUTION DE-NOISING

WEILIN LI

Abstract. This paper studies the problem of recovering a discrete complex measure on the torus from a finite number of corrupted Fourier samples. We assume the support of the unknown discrete measure satisfies a minimum separation condition and we use convex regularization methods to recover approximations of the original measure. We focus on two well-known convex regularization methods, and for both, we establish an error estimate that bounds the smoothed-out error in terms of the target resolution and noise level. Our L^∞ approximation rate is entirely new for one of the methods, and improves upon a previously established L^1 estimate for the other. We provide a unified analysis and an elementary proof of the theorem.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Overview and Contributions.** Super-resolution techniques are concerned with the recovery of high resolution features from coarse observations, and can be employed to capture information beyond the inherent resolution limit of the measurement system. Applications of super-resolution include microscopy [Lin12], astronomy [PK05], neuroscience [Rie99], medical imaging [Gre09], and geophysics [KLM04].

While there are numerous empirical results on super-resolution, the theory is still in its infancy. Candès and Fernandez-Granda [CFG14] introduced a super-resolution model where the unknown information is a discrete and periodic measure whose support set satisfies a minimum separation condition. They proved that such a measure can be uniquely recovered from a finite number of consecutive Fourier samples by solving a convex minimization problem. Several other papers [DCG12, TBSR13, ASB16, DP15] have addressed variations of this model, but it is also possible to study the super-resolution of non-discrete measures [BL16].

The literature also focused on the closely related model where the low resolution data is corrupted by additive noise. This situation is important because in applications of the theory, there might be noise due to measurement error, data corruption, or quantization. Under the same minimum separation framework, several papers [CFG13, FG13, BTR13, TBR15, ADCG15, DP15] used one of two important convex regularization methods, which we shall call Problem (SR_δ) and (SR_τ), to obtain approximations of the original measure.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42A15, 90C25, 94A12.

Key words and phrases. Super-resolution, convex optimization, convex regularization, total variation.

We also adopt the minimum separation model, but unlike the aforementioned papers, we address both convex regularization methods in a *unified* manner. To do this, we show that both methods produce measures that satisfy two (fairly weak) inequalities. We prove that any measure enjoying these properties approximates the unknown measure in a natural sense, and in particular, we can bound the error in terms of the target resolution and noise level. We prove this result using well-known techniques, but we combine the pieces in a different and more efficient manner, resulting in a *significantly simpler* argument. Our L^∞ error estimate is entirely new for Problem (SR_τ) and improves upon a previously established L^1 result for Problem (SR_δ), derived by Candès and Fernandez-Granda [CFG13].

1.2. **Background.** We first introduce some notation and discuss prior work on the noiseless case. While our results generalize to higher dimensions, for simplicity, we focus on the one-dimensional case.

Let $M(\mathbb{T})$ be the space of complex Radon measures on the torus group $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. For $\mu \in M(\mathbb{T})$, let $|\mu|$ be its variation, $\widehat{\mu}$ be its Fourier transform, and $\|\mu\|$ be its total variation. For any integer $M > 0$, let $\Lambda_M = \{-M, -M+1, \dots, M\}$ and define the projection $P_M \colon M(\mathbb{T}) \to C(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$ by

$$P_M \mu(x) = \sum_{m=-M}^{M} \widehat{\mu}(m) e^{2\pi i m x},$$

where $C(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$ is the space of trigonometric polynomials of degree M, i.e.,

$$C(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M) = \Big\{ f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{T}) \colon f(x) = \sum_{m=-M}^{M} a_m e^{2\pi i m x},\ a_m \in \mathbb{C} \Big\}.$$

We say the discrete set $S = \{s_j\}_{j=1}^J$ satisfies the Λ_M-*minimum separation condition* if

$$\min_{1 \le j < k \le J} |s_j - s_k| \ge \frac{2}{M}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the distance on $\mathbb{T}$. Let $M(\mathbb{T}, \Lambda_M)$ be the set of discrete measures on $\mathbb{T}$ whose support satisfies the Λ_M-minimal separation condition.

Candès and Fernandez-Granda [CFG14, Theorem 1.2] proved that if $\mu_0 \in M(\mathbb{T}, \Lambda_M)$ for $M \ge 128$, then μ_0 is the unique solution to the *super-resolution problem*,

$$\inf \|\mu\| \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mu \in M(\mathbb{T}) \quad \text{and} \quad P_M \mu = P_M \mu_0. \tag{SR}$$

Their proof requires the assumption that $M \ge 128$ and it is unknown whether the theorem holds for all values of $M > 0$. Further, the conclusion of their theorem still holds if we replace the numerical constant 2 in (1.1) with a smaller constant and impose a stronger condition on M. For example, the conclusion holds if the 2 is replaced with 1.26 provided that $M \ge 10^3$ [FG16, Theorem 2.2].

As previously mentioned, we are concerned with the noisy case. For this model, instead of observing the noiseless data $P_M \mu_0$, suppose we are given the corrupted

data, $P_M(\mu_0 + \eta)$. The papers [CFG13, FG13] obtained an approximation of μ_0 by solving the constrained minimization problem,

$$(\mathrm{SR}_\delta) \qquad \inf \|\mu\| \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mu \in M(\mathbb{T}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|P_M(\mu - \mu_0 - \eta)\|_{L^2} \leq \delta,$$

where $\delta > 0$ can be freely chosen. On the other hand, the papers [BTR13, TBR15, ADCG15, DP15] studied the closely related unconstrained minimization problem,

$$(\mathrm{SR}_\tau) \qquad \inf \Big(\frac{1}{2} \|P_M(\mu - \mu_0 - \eta)\|_{L^2}^2 + \tau \|\mu\| \Big) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mu \in M(\mathbb{T}),$$

where $\tau > 0$ can also be freely chosen. This problem is a special case of Tikhonov regularization.

Using standard weak-$*$ compactness arguments, it is not difficult to show that Problems (SR), (SR_δ), and (SR_τ) are well-posed, i.e., the infimum in the three minimization problems can be replaced with the minimum. Further, appropriate dual formulations of all three problems can be recast as semi-definite programs, see [CFG14, CFG13, TBR15].

The most important question in the study of regularization methods is to determine if the regularized solutions approximate the noiseless solution in some suitable sense. Suppose μ_δ and μ_τ are solutions to Problems (SR_δ) and (SR_τ), respectively. Intuitively speaking, we expect that μ_δ and μ_τ converge to μ_0 if the parameters δ and τ are chosen appropriately depending on the noise level and the noise level tends to zero. This intuition is somewhat correct, since it is possible to show convergence for a subsequence and in the weak-$*$ sense.

Such convergence statements are qualitative, whereas we want a quantitative bound. This leads us to the question: What is a natural way of quantifying the errors, $\mu_\delta - \mu_0$ and $\mu_\tau - \mu_0$? Burger-Osher [BO04] argued that, since Tikhonov regularization is achieved in the weak-$*$ topology, it would be surprising if it is possible to bound the error in the total variation norm. Since Problem (SR_τ) is a special case of Tikhonov regularization and is similar to Problem (SR_δ), it is reasonable that the same principle applies. Numerical results have shown that the supports of μ_0, μ_τ, and μ_δ can be different [CFG13, DP15], which further supports this heuristic. Thus, it appears impossible to bound $\|\mu_\delta - \mu_0\|$ and $\|\mu_\tau - \mu_0\|$ in terms of the noise level.

Since super-resolution is concerned with the recovery of fine details from coarse data, it is reasonable to bound $\mu_\delta - \mu_0$ and $\mu_\tau - \mu_0$ at small scales. Candès and Fernandez-Granda [CFG13] argued that it suffices to control smoothed-out errors at a certain resolution. For a kernel K, the smoothed out errors are $K * (\mu_\delta - \mu_0)$ and $K * (\mu_\tau - \mu_0)$.

1.3. **Results.** We are primarily concerned with the solutions to Problems (SR_δ) and (SR_τ). In order to avoid addressing each method separately, we introduce the following definition. We say $\mu \in M(\mathbb{T})$ is a (ε, Λ_M)-*approximation* of $\mu_0 \in M(\mathbb{T})$ if

$$\|\mu\| \leq \|\mu_0\| + 2\varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|P_M(\mu - \mu_0)\|_{L^2} \leq 2\varepsilon. \tag{1.2}$$

The numerical constant 2 that appears in both inequalities is unimportant; our theorem still holds for any other sufficiently large constant. Propositions 2.1 and 2.2

show that solutions to either of the convex problems are (ε, Λ_M)-approximations of $\mu_0 \in M(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$, where ε depends on the noise.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the following hold. Suppose $\mu_0 \in M(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$ for an integer $M \geq 128$ and μ is a (ε, Λ_M)-approximation of μ_0. For any twice differentiable K with $K'' \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$, we have*

$$\|K * (\mu - \mu_0)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\varepsilon\big(\|K\|_{L^\infty} + M^{-1}\|K'\|_{L^\infty} + M^{-2}\|K''\|_{L^\infty}\big). \tag{1.3}$$

Remark 1.2. Since we are given noisy observations of μ_0 up to frequency M (equivalently, at scale $1/M$) and super-resolution is concerned with the recovery of fine details, we are particularly interested in quantifying the error $\mu - \mu_0$ at scale $1/N$, for integers $N > M$. There are two natural avenues for a defining a kernel K_N that corresponds to a function of scale $1/N$.

(a) The first is in the Fourier domain. Let $K_N \in C(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_N)$. Important examples include the Dirichlet and Fejér kernels. By Bernstein's inequality for trigonometric polynomials, we have

$$\|K_N''\|_{L^\infty} \leq N\|K_N'\|_{L^\infty} \leq N^2\|K_N\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Inserting this into (1.3), we obtain

$$\|K_N * (\mu - \mu_0)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\|K_N\|_{L^\infty}\Big(\frac{N}{M}\Big)^2\varepsilon.$$

(b) The second is in the spatial domain. Suppose k is twice differentiable, k'' is bounded, and k is compactly supported in $[-\frac{1}{L}, \frac{1}{L}]$ for some $L > 2$. For an integer $N > M$, the function $k_N(x) = k(Nx)$ is compactly supported in $[-\frac{1}{LN}, \frac{1}{LN}]$. Let $K_N \in C^2(\mathbb{T})$ be the 1-periodization of k_N. We have

$$\|K_N\|_{L^\infty} = \|k\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \|K_N'\|_{L^\infty} \leq N\|k'\|_{L^\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad \|K_N''\| \leq N^2\|k''\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Inserting this into (1.3), we obtain

$$\|K_N * (\mu - \mu_0)\|_{L^\infty} \leq C\max\big(\|k\|_{L^\infty}, \|k'\|_{L^\infty}, \|k''\|_{L^\infty}\big)\Big(\frac{N}{M}\Big)^2\varepsilon.$$

1.4. **Related work.** The papers [CFG13, FG13, BTR13, TBR15, ADCG15, DP15] assume μ_0 is a discrete measure whose support satisfies the Λ_M-minimum separation condition and analyze either Problem (SR_δ) or (SR_τ).

Our result is completely different from the results contained in the aforementioned papers, with the exception of Candès and Fernandez-Granda [CFG13, Theorem 1.2]. There are also some important differences between our Theorem 1.1 and their theorem.

(a) An important difference is that our result applies to both Problems (SR_δ) and (SR_τ), whereas their theorem only applies to the former de-noising method. To our best knowledge, we are the first to establish estimate (1.3) for the latter method.

(b) Further, their theorem requires weaker assumptions on the kernel and they obtain $L^1(\mathbb{T})$ estimates. We require slightly stronger assumptions on the kernel, but in return, we obtain $L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ estimates and a greatly simplified proof. In fact, they use a complicated comparison of scales argument to derive their inequality, whereas we shall not require this type of argument. Importantly, our stronger assumptions on the kernel do not preclude any important cases, see Remark 1.2, and from this perspective, these assumptions come for free.

2. Proofs

2.1. **Notation.** Before we prove the theorem, we need to introduce some notation. For a discrete set $S = \{s_j\}_{j=1}^J \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ and integer $M > 0$, let

$$S_M(j) = \{x \in \mathbb{T} \colon |x - s_j| \leq 0.16M^{-1}\}.$$

If S satisfies the Λ_M-minimum separation condition and $j \neq k$, then $S_M(j)$ and $S_M(k)$ are disjoint. The constant 0.16 was originally chosen by Candès and Fernandez-Granda [CFG14, CFG13] in order to somewhat minimize the constants that appeared in their arguments. The following results still hold if 0.16 is replaced with a smaller positive constant constant, but the constants that appear in Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 and Theorem 1.1 would also change. For convenience, let

$$S_M = \bigcup_{j=1}^J S_M(j).$$

For a vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^K$, let v_k denote its k-th entry, and let $\|v\|_\infty = \max_{1\leq k\leq K} |v_k|$. For a $K \times K$ matrix D, let $\|D\|_\infty$ be its operator norm. Note that we reserve $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$ for functions and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ for vectors and matrices.

Throughout the remainder of this paper, we shall write $A \lesssim B$ if there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that $A \leq CB$. In particular, the constant C is independent of $\mu, \mu_0, K, M, J, \delta, \tau, \varepsilon$.

2.2. **Preliminary results.** The following proposition establishes the connection between (ε, Λ_M)-approximations of μ_0 and the solutions to Problems (SR_δ) and (SR_τ) under a certain noise model. The following result holds without assuming $\mu_0 \in M(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$ or $M \geq 128$, and clearly generalizes to higher dimensions.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mu_0 \in M(\mathbb{T})$ and $\eta \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ be unknown. Suppose we are given $P_M(\mu_0 + \eta)$ for some integer $M > 0$ and given $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\|P_M\eta\|_{L^2} \leq \varepsilon$. Set $\delta = \tau = \varepsilon$. Then, any solution to Problem (SR_δ) or (SR_τ) is a (ε, Λ_M)-approximation of μ_0.*

Proof.

(a) Let μ_δ be a solution to Problem (SR_δ). Observe that μ_0 satisfies the constraint in Problem (SR_δ) since

$$\|P_M(\mu_0 - \mu_0 - \eta)\|_{L^2} = \|P_M\eta\|_{L^2} \leq \varepsilon.$$

By definition of μ_δ being a solution, we have $\|\mu_\delta\| \leq \|\mu_0\|$. We also have

$$\|P_M(\mu_\delta - \mu_0)\|_{L^2} \leq \|P_M(\mu_\delta - \mu_0 - \eta)\|_{L^2} + \|P_M\eta\|_{L^2} \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

(b) Let μ_τ be a solution to Problem (SR_τ). By definition of μ_τ being a solution, we have

$$\varepsilon\|\mu_\tau\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|P_M(\mu_0 - \mu_0 - \eta)\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon\|\mu_0\|.$$

Rearranging, we obtain $\|\mu_\tau\| \leq \|\mu_0\| + \varepsilon/2$. The inequality,

$$\|P_M(\mu_\tau - \mu_0)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \tau,$$

requires more work and we refer to [BTR13, Lemma 1] for a proof.

□

The previous proposition assumed that the noise satisfies $\|P_M\eta\|_{L^2} \leq \varepsilon$, and in particular, this implies $|\widehat{\eta}(m)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $m \in \Lambda_M$. If we do not want to assume that $\widehat{\eta}(m)$ is bounded, an alternative noise model is to assume that $\widehat{\eta}(m)$ is a Gaussian random variable. The following proposition shows that, with high probability, solutions to both convex problems are still (ε, Λ_M)-approximations.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\mu_0 \in M(\mathbb{T})$ and $\eta \in L^2(\mathbb{T})$ be unknown. Suppose we are given $P_M(\mu_0 + \eta)$ for some integer $M > 0$ and the real and complex parts of $\widehat{\eta}(m)$ are i.i.d. Gaussian random variables with mean zero and variance σ^2. For a parameter $\gamma > 0$, set*

$$\varepsilon = \delta = \tau = \sigma(1+\gamma)\sqrt{2(2M+1)}. \tag{2.1}$$

With probability at least $1 - e^{-2(2M+1)\gamma^2}$, any solution to Problem (SR_δ) or (SR_τ) is a (ε, Λ_M)-approximation of μ_0.

Proof. By Parseval's equality, note that

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^2}\|P_M\eta\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{m=-M}^{M} \frac{|\widehat{\eta}(m)|^2}{\sigma^2},$$

is a χ^2 random variable with $2(2M+1)$ degrees of freedom. By inequality (4.3) in [LM00, Section 4], for all $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\frac{1}{\sigma^2}\|P_M\eta\|_{L^2}^2 \geq 2(2M+1) + 2\sqrt{2(2M+1)x} + 2x\Big) \leq e^{-x}.$$

Set $x = 2(2M+1)\gamma^2$. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\|P_M\eta\|_{L^2} \geq \sigma(1+\gamma)\sqrt{2(2M+1)}\Big) \leq e^{-2(2M+1)\gamma^2}.$$

With probability at least $1 - e^{-2(2M+1)\gamma^2}$, we have

$$\|P_M\eta\|_{L^2} \leq \sigma(1+\gamma)\sqrt{2(2M+1)} = \varepsilon.$$

The conclusion follows from Proposition 2.1. □

The following proposition shows that a weighted integral of $|\mu - \mu_0|$ on S_M^c can be controlled in terms of ε, provided that the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 hold. This result first appeared in [CFG13, Lemma 2.1], but only for the difference $|\mu_\delta - \mu_0|$. A similar, but not identical, result for $|\mu_\tau - \mu_0|$ was proved in [TBR15, Lemma 2].

Proposition 2.3. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the following hold. Suppose $\mu_0 \in M(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$ for an integer $M \geq 128$, $S = \{s_j\}_{j=1}^J$ is the support of μ_0, and μ is a (ε, Λ_M)-approximation of μ_0. Then,*

$$\int_{S_M^c} d|\mu - \mu_0| \leq C\varepsilon,$$

$$\sum_j \int_{S_M(j)} |x - s_j|^2 \, d|\mu - \mu_0|(x) \leq CM^{-2}\varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let $\nu = \mu - \mu_0$. It was shown in [CFG13, Lemma 2.4] that there exist $f \in C(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$ with $\|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$ and universal constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_S d|\nu| &= \Big| \int_S f \, d\nu \Big| \\
&\leq \Big| \int_{\mathbb{T}} f \, d\nu \Big| + \Big| \int_{S_M^c} f \, d\nu \Big| + \Big| \sum_j \int_{S_M(j) \setminus \{s_j\}} f \, d\nu \Big| \\
&\leq \Big| \int_{\mathbb{T}} f \, d\nu \Big| + \int_{S^c} d|\nu| - C_1 \int_{S_M^c} d|\nu| - C_2 M^2 \int_{S_M} |x - s_j|^2 \, d|\nu|(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging, we obtain

$$C_1 \int_{S_M^c} d|\nu| + C_2 M^2 \int_{S_M} |x - s_j|^2 \, d|\nu|(x) \leq \Big| \int_{\mathbb{T}} f \, d\nu \Big| + \int_{S^c} d|\nu| - \int_S d|\nu|. \tag{2.2}$$

By definition of (ε, Λ_M)-approximation, $f \in C(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$, and that $\|f\|_{L^2} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$, we see that

$$\Big| \int_{\mathbb{T}} f \, d\nu \Big| \leq \|f\|_{L^2} \|P_M \nu\|_{L^2} \leq 2\varepsilon. \tag{2.3}$$

By definition of (ε, Λ_M)-approximation and that μ_0 is supported in S, we have

$$2\varepsilon + \|\mu_0\| \geq \|\mu\| = \|\mu_0 + \nu\| \geq \int_S d|\mu_0| - \int_S d|\nu| + \int_{S^c} d|\nu|.$$

Rearranging this inequality, we obtain

$$\int_{S^c} d|\nu| - \int_S d|\nu| \leq 2\varepsilon. \tag{2.4}$$

Combining inequalities (2.2), (2.3) and (2.4) completes the proof. □

The following proposition is a generalization of [CFG13, Lemmas 2.5 and 2.7], and shows that there exists $f \in C(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$ that behaves like an affine function on each $S_M(j)$.

Proposition 2.4. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the following hold. Suppose $M \geq 128$ and the set $S = \{s_j\}_{j=1}^J \subseteq \mathbb{T}$ satisfies the Λ_M-minimum separation condition. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^J$, there exists $f \in C(\mathbb{T}^d; \Lambda_M)$ such that*

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq C(\|a\|_\infty + M^{-1}\|b\|_\infty),$$
$$|f(x) - a_j - b_j(x - s_j)| \leq C(M^2\|a\|_\infty + M\|b\|_\infty)|x - s_j|^2, \quad x \in S_M(j).$$

Proof. Following the recipe given in [CFG14, Section 2], it is possible to explicitly construct the desired f. Let

$$G(x) = \Big(\frac{\sin((\frac{M}{2}+1)\pi x)}{(\frac{M}{2}+1)\sin(\pi x)}\Big)^4,$$

and note that $G \in C(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$. We claim that there exist $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}^J$ such that if we define f by

$$f(x) = \sum_j \alpha_j G(x - s_j) + \sum_j \beta_j G'(x - s_j),$$

then

$$f(s_j) = a_j, \quad \text{and} \quad f'(s_j) = b_j. \tag{2.5}$$

To see why, we define the matrices $D_0, D_1, D_2 \in \mathbb{C}^{J\times J}$, where

$$(D_0)_{j,k} = G(s_j - s_k), \quad (D_1)_{j,k} = G'(s_j - s_k), \quad \text{and} \quad (D_2)_{j,k} = G''(s_j - s_k).$$

To prove the existence of the desired f, it suffices to show that there exists a solution to system of equations,

$$\begin{pmatrix} D_0 & D_1 \\ D_1 & D_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}.$$

It was shown in [CFG14, Section 2] that the Λ_M-minimum separation condition on S and the assumption $M \geq 128$ imply that the system is invertible and that the unique solution is given by

$$\alpha = D_0^{-1}(a - D_1\beta),$$
$$\beta = (D_2 - D_1D_0^{-1}D_1)^{-1}(b - D_1D_0^{-1}a).$$

This proves the existence of f satisfying conditions (2.5).

Next, we obtain estimates on α, β. It was also shown in [CFG14, Section 2] that

$$\|D_0^{-1}\|_\infty \lesssim 1,$$
$$\|D_1\|_\infty \lesssim M,$$
$$\|(D_2 - D_1D_0^{-1}D_1)^{-1}\|_\infty \lesssim M^{-2}.$$

These inequalities imply

$$\|\beta\|_\infty \lesssim M^{-1}\|a\|_\infty + M^{-2}\|b\|_\infty,$$
$$\|\alpha\|_\infty \lesssim \|a\|_\infty + M^{-1}\|b\|_\infty.$$

It was shown in [CFG14, Section 2] that

$$\sum_{k\neq j} |G^{(\ell)}(x-s_k)| \lesssim M^\ell, \quad x \in S_M(j) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell = 0,1,2,3.$$

Since $G^{(\ell)}$ decays rapidly away from the origin, the above inequalities imply, for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |f(x)| &\leq \|\alpha\|_\infty \sum_j |G(x-s_j)| + \|\beta\|_\infty \sum_j |G'(x-s_j)| \\ &\lesssim \|a\|_\infty + M^{-1}\|b\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first inequality of the proposition.

On each $S_M(j)$, define the function $h_j(x) = f(x) - a_j - b_j(x-s_j)$. It follows from (2.5) that $h_j(s_j) = h_j'(s_j) = 0$. For all $x \in S_M(j)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |h_j''(x)| = |f''(x)| &\leq \|\alpha\|_\infty \sum_k |G''(x-s_k)| + \|\beta\|_\infty \sum_k |G'''(x-s_k)| \\ &\lesssim M^2\|a\|_\infty + M\|b\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Using Taylor expansions of h_j around s_j, we obtain

$$|f(x) - a_j - b_j(x-s_j)| \lesssim (M^2\|a\|_\infty + M\|b\|_\infty)|x-s_j|^2, \quad x \in S_M(j).$$

□

2.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Let $\nu = \mu - \mu_0$ and fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{T}$. Since $\mu_0 \in M(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$, we know that μ_0 is supported in some discrete set $S = \{s_j\}_{j=1}^J$ satisfying the Λ_M-separation condition. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |(K*\nu)(x_0)| &= \Big| \int_{\mathbb{T}} K(x_0 - x)\, d\nu(x) \Big| \\ &\leq \Big| \sum_j \int_{S_M(j)} K(x_0-x)\, d\nu(x) \Big| + \|K\|_{L^\infty} \int_{S_M^c} d|\nu|. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

The first-order Taylor expansion of $K(x_0 - x)$ around the point $x_0 - s_j$ on the interval $S_M(j)$ is

$$K(x_0-x) = K(x_0-s_j) + K'(x_0-s_j)(s_j-x) + \frac{1}{2}K''(z_j)|x-s_j|^2, \quad x \in S_M(j),$$

for some $z_j \in \mathbb{T}$ depending on x_0, x, s_j. Inserting this into (2.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(K*\nu)(x_0)| \leq{}& \Big| \sum_j \int_{S_M(j)} (K(x_0-s_j) - K'(x_0-s_j)(x-s_j))\, d\nu(x) \Big| \\ &+ \|K''\|_{L^\infty} \sum_j \int_{S_M(j)} |x-s_j|^2\, d|\nu|(x) + \|K\|_{L^\infty} \int_{S_M^c} d|\nu|. \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

To bound the first term on the right hand side, we use an interpolation argument. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^J$ such that $a_j = K(x_0 - s_j)$ and $b_j = -K'(x_0 - s_j)$. Let $f \in C(\mathbb{T}; \Lambda_M)$ be a function satisfying the properties in Proposition 2.4. We have

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|K\|_{L^\infty} + M^{-1}\|K'\|_{L^\infty}, \tag{2.8}$$

$$|f(x) - a_j - b_j(x - s_j)| \lesssim (M^2\|K\|_{L^\infty} + M\|K'\|_{L^\infty})|x - s_j|^2, \quad x \in S_M(j). \tag{2.9}$$

Inequality (2.9) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\sum_j \int_{S_M(j)} (K(x_0 - s_j) - K'(x_0 - s_j)(x - s_j))\, d\nu(x)\Big| \\
&\quad \le \Big|\sum_j \int_{S_M(j)} (f(x) - K(x_0 - s_j) + K'(x_0 - s_j)(x - s_j))\, d\nu(x)\Big| + \Big|\int_{S_M} f\, d\nu\Big| \\
&\quad \lesssim \big(M^2\|K\|_{L^\infty} + M\|K'\|_{L^\infty}\big) \sum_j \int_{S_M(j)} |x - s_j|^2\, d|\nu|(x) + \Big|\int_{\mathbb{T}} f\, d\nu\Big| + \Big|\int_{S_M^c} f\, d\nu\Big|.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Using inequality (2.8), we obtain

$$\Big|\int_{S_M^c} f\, d\nu\Big| \lesssim \big(\|K\|_{L^\infty} + M^{-1}\|K'\|_{L^\infty}\big) \int_{S_M^c} d|\nu|. \tag{2.11}$$

Using inequality (2.8) and the definition of a (ε, Λ_M)-approximation, we see that

$$\Big|\int_{\mathbb{T}} f\, d\nu\Big| \le \|f\|_{L^2}\|P_M\nu\|_{L^2} \lesssim \big(\|K\|_{L^\infty} + M^{-1}\|K'\|_{L^\infty}\big)\varepsilon. \tag{2.12}$$

Combining inequalities (2.7), (2.10), (2.11) and (2.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|(K * \nu)(x_0)| \lesssim\ & \big(\|K\|_{L^\infty} + M^{-1}\|K'\|_{L^\infty}\big)\varepsilon \\
&+ \big(\|K\|_{L^\infty} + M^{-1}\|K'\|_{L^\infty}\big) \int_{S_M^c} d|\nu| \\
&+ \big(M^2\|K\|_{L^\infty} + M\|K'\|_{L^\infty} + \|K''\|_{L^\infty}\big) \sum_j \int_{S_M(j)} |x - s_j|^2\, d|\nu|(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we apply Proposition 2.3 to complete the proof.

3. Acknowledgements

The author thanks Professors John J. Bendetto and Hans G. Feichtinger for their helpful feedback and interest in the manuscript. This work was partially supported by DTRA Grant 1-13-1-0015.

References

[ADCG15] Jean-Marc Azaïs, Yohann De Castro, and Fabrice Gamboa. Spike detection from inaccurate samplings. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 38(2):177–195, 2015.

[ASB16] Céline Aubel, David Stotz, and Helmut Bölcskei. A theory of super-resolution from short-time Fourier transform measurements. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, To appear, 2016.

[BC09] John J. Benedetto and Wojciech Czaja. *Integration and Modern Analysis*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, 2009.

[BL16] John J. Benedetto and Weilin Li. Super-resolution by means of Beurling minimal extrapolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.05761*, 2016.

[BO04] Martin Burger and Stanley Osher. Convergence rates of convex variational regularization. *Inverse problems*, 20(5):1411, 2004.

[BTR13] Badri Narayan Bhaskar, Gongguo Tang, and Benjamin Recht. Atomic norm denoising with applications to line spectral estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 61(23):5987–5999, 2013.

[CFG13] Emmanuel J. Candès and Carlos Fernandez-Granda. Super-resolution from noisy data. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 19(6):1229–1254, 2013.

[CFG14] Emmanuel J. Candès and Carlos Fernandez-Granda. Towards a mathematical theory of super-resolution. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 67(6):906–956, 2014.

[DCG12] Yohann De Castro and Fabrice Gamboa. Exact reconstruction using Beurling minimal extrapolation. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 395(1):336–354, 2012.

[DP15] Vincent Duval and Gabriel Peyré. Exact support recovery for sparse spikes deconvolution. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 15(5):1315–1355, 2015.

[FG13] Carlos Fernandez-Granda. Support detection in super-resolution. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Sampling Theory and Applications*, pages 145–148, 2013.

[FG16] Carlos Fernandez-Granda. Super-resolution of point sources via convex programming. *Information and Inference*, pages 251–303, 2016.

[Gre09] Hayit Greenspan. Super-resolution in medical imaging. *The Computer Journal*, 52(1):43–63, 2009.

[KLM04] Valery Khaidukov, Evgeny Landa, and Tijmen Jan Moser. Diffraction imaging by focusing-defocusing: An outlook on seismic superresolution. *Geophysics*, 69(6):1478–1490, 2004.

[Lin12] Jari Lindberg. Mathematical concepts of optical superresolution. *Journal of Optics*, 14(8):083001, 2012.

[LM00] Beatrice Laurent and Pascal Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1302–1338, 2000.

[PK05] Klaus G. Puschmann and Franz Kneer. On super-resolution in astronomical imaging. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 436(1):373–378, 2005.

[Rie99] Fred Rieke. *Spikes: Exploring the Neural code*. MIT press, 1999.

[TBR15] Gongguo Tang, Badri Narayan Bhaskar, and Benjamin Recht. Near minimax line spectral estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 61(1):499–512, 2015.

[TBSR13] Gongguo Tang, Badri Narayan Bhaskar, Parikshit Shah, and Benjamin Recht. Compressed sensing off the grid. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 59(11):7465–7490, 2013.

Norbert Wiener Center, Department of Mathematics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

E-mail address: wl298@math.umd.edu